



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/630,000	08/01/2000	Bruce Tockman	279.246US1	8111
21186	7590	07/07/2004	EXAMINER	
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A. P.O. BOX 2938 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402			EVANISKO, GEORGE ROBERT	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3762	

DATE MAILED: 07/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/630,000	TOCKMAN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	George R Evanisko	3762

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 24 May 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) The period for reply expires ____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
 - (a) they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: ____.

3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 103 rejection of claim 44.
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) ____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: ____.

Claim(s) objected to: ____.

Claim(s) rejected: ____.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: ____.

8. The drawing correction filed on ____ is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.

9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). ____.

10. Other: IDSs attached

George R Evanisko
Primary Examiner
Art Unit: 3762

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the arguments are not persuasive. The arguments that there are no objective reasons to selectively modify Nelson and Cross and that the Examiner has not identified an objective source for the motivation of Nelson and Cross are not persuasive. First, it must be realized that a 103 rejection is an admission that the prior art does not teach every element in the claim and therefore a combination of references or a reliance on common knowledge in the art or legal precedent is necessary to provide the missing limitation(s). The examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Nelson and Cross do not teach the first and second conductors being different materials, with the first material having a different stiffness than the second material. But Nelson and Cross do teach that different conductors can be used in their leads. It was stated that it was well known in the art to provide different materials for the conductors, with the first material having a different stiffness than the second material (this being the modification of the primary references, since the primary references state that different conductors can be used and since both the primary and the three secondary references, provided to show obviousness and show well known in the art, are medical leads and use different conductors). The motivation to combine being that the different materials and stiffnesses provide "different and required impedance/resistances, different current carrying capabilities, and/or different flexibility/stiffness to the lead". Therefore, the 103 rejection is proper. Also, the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981). In addition, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971). In addition, the argument that Nelson or Cross teach away from the 103 combination because Nelson or Cross teach that the lead can be stiffened by inserting a stiffening element in the channels or are provided with a stiffening core are not persuasive since Nelson or Cross do not preclude the use of stiffening the lead with conductors. Nelson and Cross teach a way to stiffen the lead, but do not state that this is the only way that it can be stiffened. Numerous ways are possible to stiffen the lead, from using a stiffening element, to a stylet, conductors, and/or different lead materials, etc. Finally, sources for rationale supporting a rejection under 103 can be in a reference, or reasoned from common knowledge in the art, scientific principles, art-recognized equivalents, or legal precedent (MPEP 2144) and the examiner has previously provided references to show the teachings for the 103 rejections of being common knowledge in the art.